DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 392 UD 011 304

AUTHOR	Barr, Jo
TITLE	A Resume of the Findings of the Follow Through Project Evaluation, 1969-70.
INSTITUTION	Wichita Unified School District 259, Kans.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 70
NOTE	52p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement, Achievement Tests, *Bus Transportation, *Integration Effects, Integration Methods, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Race Relations, Racial Attitudes, *School Integration, Student Adjustment
IDENTIFIERS	Kansas, *Project Follow Through, Wichita Public Schools

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes the findings of the 1969-70 evaluation of Project Follow Through in Wichita, Kansas. In the first year of the program, 186 Head Start graduates were bused from low income residential areas to four elementary schools located on the periphery of the city. The receiving schools varied in socioeconomic status of pupils from middle class to working class. The 1969-70 school year completed the second year of Wichita's Follow Through Project. Students were evaluated by questionnaires given to teachers; in addition, to measure pupil adjustment and achievement, tests such as the Cognitive Abilities Test, the California Test of Personality, and the Illincis Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities were given. Parent participation was encouraged. The results of the Cognitive Abilities Test indicate that though Follow Through students scored higher than Head Start students at pretest, by post test there were no significant differences; both groups, however, made significant gains. In the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities, the experimental Follow Through students, after two years, scored significantly higher than control groups. It is held that the program had some good results. (Author/JW)

ED048392

WICHITA PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Unified School District 259
Dr. Alvin E. Morris, Superintendent

1969-70
A RESUME OF THE FINDINGS OF THE FOLLOW THROUGH PROJECT EVALUATION

UD011304

Prepared by

(Mrs.) Jo Barr, Research Specialist

Research and Evaluation Services Division
Dr. Ralph E. Walker, Director

August, 1970

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	1
LOCAL ORGANIZATION OF FOLLOW THROUGH	3
Philosophical Rationale for the Instructional Method	3
DESCRIPTION OF COMPARISON GROUPS	6
MEASURES USED	10
FINDINGS	
CLASSROOM ORGANIZATION	10
TEACHER AND TEACHER AIDE QUESTIONNAIRES	13
Teacher Background Information and Turnover Rate	13
Teacher Perception of Pupil Improvement	14
Problems with Follow Through Pupils	14
Teacher Perception of Positive and Negative Aspects of Integrated Education	15
Teacher Reaction to Assistance given by Program Assistant.	17
Follow Through Response to Job Training	18
Teacher Comments about Effectiveness with the TEEM Model	19
Teacher Responses to Parent Participation	19
Background Information on Responses from Teacher Aides	21
PARENT PARTICIPATION	22
Conclusion	24
COGNITIVE ABILITIES TEST	27
Introduction	27
Instrumentation	29
Findings	30
THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY	32
Introduction	32
Findings	33
LEE-CLARK READING READINESS TEST	35
Introduction	35
Findings	36

PAGE

ILLINOIS TEST OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ABILITIES 37

Introduction 37
Findings 39
Conclusion 44

THE KINDERGARTEN CHECK LIST 46

Introduction 46

Findings 47

PREFACE

The Follow Through Program is authorized under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, the basic purpose of which is to stimulate a better focusing of all available local, state and federal resources upon the goal of enabling low-income families and low-income individuals of all ages to attain the skills, knowledge and opportunities needed for them to become fully self-sufficient. Follow Through communities are asked for a commitment to implement processes leading

" 1. To the direct participation of the parents of Follow Through children in the development, conduct and overall direction of the project.

2. The involvement of agencies, organizations and other community resources that have a concern for the poor.

3. The creation of a climate in which communication between the poor and the non-poor can be achieved and in which a partnership between the school and community can be realized." *

The Follow Through project was developed by the Office of Education to sustain and supplement in the early grades the educational advantages of low-income children who have had a full year's experience in Head Start or comparable pre-school program. Specifically, federal funds have been made available to help school systems develop programs aimed at compensating children from racially, socially and economically

*See National Follow Through Guidelines, February 1969

disadvantaged families for handicaps that are due to family situations and life styles.

During the 1969-70 school year, Follow Through projects were implemented in some 140 school systems throughout the United States. These projects were designed not only to meet the instructional needs of young children, but in addition the psychological, nutritional and medical needs as well. Too, parent participation was considered a significant component of every Follow Through project. Developers of the Follow Through concept take cognizance of the fact that a child and his behavior are influenced by many facets of his life space, i.e., the family, the neighborhood, the community and the school; therefore to consider the child in the vacuum of the academic setting alone is to do an injustice to the effect that education programs can have on him. It is a well-established fact that a child who is without shoes and adequately warm clothing and/or is ill, tired or hungry will not be able to make use of school programs no matter how "special" they are. Follow Through attempts to ameliorate the inadequacies of impoverished home life by insuring that each low-income child comes to school with his physical and mental needs having been considered. Follow Through teachers, staff psychologists, social workers, nurses, parent coordinators as well as persons from other service agencies work together to minimize adverse influences and maximize beneficial effects on the low-income child's learning and development.

The United States Office of Education has identified a number of groups and institutions which have demonstrated conceptual as well as practical knowledge of successful techniques and approaches in working

with low-income pupils. These approaches vary in scope and focus and include different strategies directed toward instructional, parent education, and other practices. The group or institution associated with a given approach or "model" is identified as a program sponsor. Follow Through programs therefore vary according to the systematically different approaches or models that are being tried. Model sponsors are selected by local Follow Through school systems and/or communities based on the match conceptually and practically between local school system personnel and the model sponsor.

A national evaluation of Follow Through is underway and in several years should provide information as to the efficacy of the various education strategies utilized by different model sponsors.

Generally speaking, the first year of funding, low-income children with full year Head Start or other preschool experience enter the Follow Through project their first year of public school (kindergarten or first grade). The The Follow Through project is expanded the second year to include children in the next higher grade; the next year the project is expanded another grade. Presently Follow Through is conceived as a K-3 project.

THE LOCAL ORGANIZATION OF FOLLOW THROUGH

During the 1969-70 school year Wichita completed its second year of Follow Through. In both the fall of 1968 and the fall 1969, approximately one-half the graduates of full year Head Start were chosen in a stratified random selection to participate in the Follow Through project; the remaining one-half full year Head Start graduates attended their regular neighborhood

schools. In September 1969, one hundred eighty-six low-income full year Head Start graduates selected for Follow Through (HSFT) were bused from low-income residential areas to four elementary schools located on the periphery of the city. * The receiving schools varied somewhat in the socioeconomic status of their pupils: three schools could be considered solidly middle class; the fourth school was comprised of children approximately half of which came from lower working class homes and half from middle class homes. This school was the only one which had non-white families living in the district.

HSFT were placed in eight kindergarten and seven first grade classrooms to which neighborhood pupils (FTCL) had also been assigned. These children were in the main from low-income families.*

It should be noted that the racial and socioeconomic mix of children in the Wichita Follow Through project occurred by explicit design; Federal Guidelines state,

"In Follow Through, maximum feasible social, economic and racial mixture of children is encouraged".***

Local program planners and managers agreed that a heterogeneous school environment, encompassing a broad range of social, economic and ethnic patterns would be an effective plan for maximizing educational opportunities of both advantaged and disadvantaged pupils. This is <u>not</u> to say that one

* Though four low-income Follow Through pupils lived in the neighborhood in which they attended school and were therefore not bused, the category low-income bused is descriptive of HSFT pupils.
** Approximately two Follow Through classmates came from low-income families, the category non-low-income is descriptive of FTCL pupils.
*** See National Follow Through Program Guidelines, February 24, 1969 page 4

group of children were expected to achieve at the expense of another group, but rather, the advantage of mixing would accrue to both groups in order for program managers to adjudge the Follow Through project successful. The local research staff took this fact into account in the research design and the selection of comparison groups. (See the discussion of comparison groups, pages 6 - 9).

The Philosophical Rationale for the Instructional Method

The Tucson Early Education Model (TEEM), developed by the University of Arizona Center for Early Childhood Education was selected by local Follow Through program planners and managers as the means by which Follow Through would be implemented in Wichita. The model emphasizes pupil individualization as well as program processes such as pupil imitation of teacher-modeled behavior, pupil discrimination of important educational cues, and such teacher techniques as social reinforcement through praise, attention and affection.* In Wichita, Follow Through classrooms were arranged with four to seven interest centers per classroom, depending on class size; pupils in small groups of 3-5 children spent about 80% of the total classroom time participating in small group activities at interest centers. The arrangement of classrooms into behavior settings tended to facilitate interaction among pupils and adults in the classroom. Tables were arranged to facilitate small group instruction and to make it possible for heterogeneous groupings of children to work independently. At least one period during the day was open to self-selection activities in which the child had responsibility for the organization of his own activities

* See Annual Report, Arizona Early Education Center, June 23, 1969.

around the available materials and space. Children were encouraged to actively engage themselves in the learning process during structured activities through verbalization, handling materials and participating in demonstrations. Children were induced to learn by doing; teachers were endeavored to reinforce aspects of a child's behavior which were congruent with educational aims.

The stated objectives for pupils of the TEEM model include the development of:

1. An intellectual base
2. Language competence
3. A motivational base
4. Societal arts and skills, i. e., reading, mathematics and skills for social interaction.

DESCRIPTION OF COMPARISON GROUPS

In order to assess the impact of the Follow Through project on kindergarten and first grade pupils, the evaluation plan called for the designation of five comparison groups of kindergarten pupils and five comparison groups of three low-income groups and two non-low-income groups, namely,

1. Full year Head Start graduates randomly selected for Follow Through
2. Head Start graduates not selected for Follow Through
3. Low-income pupils having not had either Head Start or Follow Through
4. Non-low-income groups were comprised of neighborhood classmates of low-income bused Follow Through pupils and

5. Non-low income pupils not participating in Follow Through.

Group 5 was utilized as a means of evaluating the academic progress of neighborhood classmates in order to examine and note the effect of Follow Through on the pupil achievement of this non-low-income group participating in Follow Through. It should be noted that information was not gathered on all ten groups with all instruments or tests included in the 1969-70 Follow Through research design. As the findings are discussed on each test or instrument, the comparison groups utilized will be noted.

Specifically the kindergarten groups were identified as follows:

1. Head Start Follow Through --HSFT--(Experimental group)

   The group consisted of children from low-income families who graduated from full year Head Start in 1969 and who, in the fall, 1969, were enrolled in their first year of Follow Through. Children were bused from low-income areas to public schools located in the outer areas of the city where they were placed in classrooms to which local neighborhood children were also assigned.* Classes were provided a special curriculum and special teaching staff, and low-income bused children received the comprehensive services noted in the previous section.

2. Follow Through Classmates--FTCL

   The group was comprised of kindergarten classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (HSFT). They attended the neighborhood school and, in the main, were from non-low-income families.**

* Though four low-income Follow Through pupils lived in the neighborhood in which they attended school and were, therefore, not bused, the category low-income bused is descriptive of HSFT pupils.

** Though two Follow Through classmates came from low-income families, the category non-low-income is descriptive of FTCL pupils.

3. Head Start Non-Follow Through --HSNFT

   The group consisted of kindergarten pupils from low-income families who graduated from full year Head Start in 1969, were not selected to participate in the Follow Through project and in the fall, 1969, attended neighborhood schools.

4. Non-Head Start Non-Follow Through Low-Income---NHSNFT-LI

   A selection was made of kindergarten pupils from low-income families who had not participated in full year Head Start and who attended neighborhood school.

5. Non-Head Start Non-Follow Through --Non-Low-Income--NHSNFT-NLI

   A random selection of kindergarten pupils who attended four non-low-income schools was made. The non-low-income comparison schools were chosen in the following manner:

   Each elementary school in which there were Follow Through classrooms was paired with a non-low-income school on the basis of comparability of:

   -1968 third grade ITBS mean scores
   -socioeconomic status of the school areas as determined by a panel of property assessors.

The first grade groups were as follows:

1. Head Start Follow Through--HSFT (Experimental group)

   The group consised of children from low-income families who graduated from full year Head Start in 1968 and who, during

1969-70, enrolled in the second year of the Follow Through project. A random sample of these children were given the total ITPA in the fall of 1968 and again in the spring, 1969. Two subtests of the ITPA were administered to the same sample of pupils in the spring, 1970.

2. Follow Through Classmates--FTCL

   The group was comprised of a random selection of neighborhood pupils, classmates of HSFT.

3. Head Start Non-Follow Through --HSNFT

   The group consisted of 1968 Head Start graduates who were not selected to participate in the Follow Through project and have attended neighborhood schools for two full years by the end of the 1969-70 school year. A random selection of this group was made and administered the total ITPA in the fall, 1968 and again in the spring, 1969. Two subtests of the ITPA were administered to the same sample group in the spring, 1970.

4. Non-Head Start Non-Follow Through--Low-Income--NHSNFT-LI

   A selection was made of children from low-income families who had not participated in full year Head Start or Follow Through and who attended neighborhood schools.

5. Non-Head Start Non-Follow Through--Non-Low-Income--NHSNFT-NLI

   A random selection of children attending four non-low-income schools was made. These children had not participated in full year Head Start or Follow Through.

MEASURES USED

Follow Through classes were described in terms of numbers of pupils per classroom, race, sex and percentage of low-income bused Follow Through pupils. Pupil attendance and teacher mobility were noted. Questionnaires administered to Follow Through teachers and teacher aides yielded information about their education attainment, work experience, and job training as well as their perceptions of pupil achievement, interaction and attitudes. Their impressions of the effects of Follow Through on others were elicited.

Investigation of Follow Through parent participation was limited to a quantitative analysis of records kept by Follow Through staff.

Instruments utilized in the analysis of pupil adjustment and achievement were:

1. The Cognitive Abilities Test
2. The California Test of Personality
3. The Kindergarten Check List
4. The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities
5. The Lee Clark Reading Readiness Test

FINDINGS

CLASS ROOM ORGANIZATION

In the fall, 1969 one hundred eighty-six low-income kindergarten and first grade Follow Through pupils were placed in classrooms in varying proportions: in the classrooms of Two Follow Through schools the percentage of low-income pupils averaged around 40%; the percentage of low-income bused

pupils at the remaining two schools was about 65%. Program managers indicated that this variation was due to available classroom space at the four Follow Through receiving schools. The proportion of non-white pupils in the low-income bused group varied from 50% to 100%. At only one Follow Through school were there non-white neighborhood classmates. The remaining three Follow Through schools provided only white neighborhood pupils.

The distribution of male/female pupils in Follow Through classrooms was well balanced in all but two classrooms; here there were less than 30% male children in Follow Through classrooms. Class size ranged from 20-33 pupils; the median size was 23. In short, it can be said that Follow Through classrooms were comprised of both low-income bused pupils and non-low-income neighborhood classmates. The proportion of low-income to non-low-income children varied from school to school as did the proportion of white-non-white pupils. In classrooms pupils moved in small groups through a series of interest centers designed to provide maximum educational input.

At the end of the school year a loss of four low-income bused pupils and six neighborhood classmates was observed from an examination of enrollment records. Losses in Follow Through pupils were attributed by Follow Through staff to residence changes and transfers outside the system. The analysis of enrollment records did not include total pupil mobility in and out of the Follow Through project, but rather included only a description of a two point in time, namely fall and spring enrollment changes.

Attendance ratios indicated that low-income bused kindergarten Follow Through pupils attended school less well than did either of the two low-income comparison groups who attended neighborhood schools; however, first

grade low-income bused pupils attended better than the average city wide first grade pupil and attended equal to or better than the low-income comparison groups. In both kindergarten and first grade the two non-low-income comparison groups attended above the city wide average.

It would be interesting to study the possible effects of class size and composition in terms of race and socioeconomic mix on the achievement of pupils. In addition a study of pupil mobility in and out of the Follow Through program could provide illuminating information in terms of the gross effect of the Follow Through project.

TEACHER AND TEACHER AIDE QUESTIONNAIRES

In the early spring, 1970, research staff, with the assistance of Follow Through personnel and public school administrators revised a questionnaire (utilized last year) to elicit comments and opinions of Follow Through teachers and teacher aides. The responses of Follow Through teaching personnel tended to be succinct, cogent and illuminating. However, certain items elicited no response or elicited responses that did not answer the question. These items should be re-evaluated.

Every precaution was used to protect the anonymity of the respondent; however, research staff made concerted efforts through direct quotes to convey the same quality of expression. The responses of 13 teachers were utilized.

Background Information; Turnover Rate - Follow Through Teachers

It was found that Follow Through teachers tend to be young (the mean age was 30), hold fewer Masters degrees by half, when compared with all elementary teachers in the Wichita system; over half received their last educational degree in the past five years; almost half have less than five years of teaching experience. Over half the Follow Through teachers taught the same grade level as they had taught previously.

Most of the Follow Through teachers taught their first year in the Follow Through program during the second year of the project, 1969-70. One fifth of the Follow Through teachers were Negro which is more than double the percentage of the Negro elementary teachers in the system as a whole. The turnover rate of Follow Through teachers the first year

was about three times as great as the elementary teacher turnover for the system as a whole during the 1968-69 school year. The two year turnover rate of the original seven teachers reached 85.7%. The turnover rate for the second year of the Follow Through project was about two and one half times the 1968-69 elementary turnover rate for the system as a whole. A study of the casual factors relating to high teacher turnover rates as well as the effect of high teacher turnover rates on Follow Through pupils achievement may be warranted.

Follow Through Teacher Perception of Pupil Improvement

Follow Through teachers were asked their perceptions of pupil performance improvement in relation to the TEEM goals of developing language competency, an intellectual base, a motivational base, and societal arts and skills; viz., social skills of cooperation and democratic process as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic skills. Most kindergarten Follow Through teachers perceived that their pupils greatest improvement came in the areas of language competency and motivation. Teachers of first grade Follow Through pupils saw greatest improvement in the area of societal arts and skills.

Teacher Perceived Problems with Follow Through Pupils

When teachers were asked about problems in their classrooms, over 45% indicated the following:

1. Absence due to missing the bus (all Follow Through teachers noted this as a problem)
2. Attention span
3. Behavior

4. Absence due to illness

5. Inability to assume responsibility

6. Overall attendance

One teacher perceived that other teachers in the building were a problem in relation to low-income bused pupils.

(Another problem is) "getting other teachers to accept children who come on the bus. (They) advocate that no problems existed on the playground until those children came. The children very quickly picked up the cues of what the teachers wanted and supplied the situation...."

Teacher Perceived Positive and Negative Aspects of Integrated Education

When asked to comment on the positive effects of classrooms designed to provide opportunity for interaction between children of different racial and economic backgrounds, 50% of the teachers did not answer the question asked or did not respond. Those who did answer the question responded briefly, though positively, i.e., "They learn from each other. They find out color doesn't make a person different" or "Racial knowledge; first hand relationships".

Thirty-eight percent of Follow Through teachers did not respond to the question about the negative (if any) aspects of primary school classrooms designed to provide opportunities for interaction between children of different racial and economic backgrounds. The following are indicative of the general quality of response.

"When the majority of the classroom is disadvantaged, they have a tendency to set the tone and pattern for the classroom. The advantaged child sometimes retrogresses", or "Some children have more and show it ".

Further investigation is needed to determine the reasons for invalid or no response to these questions. It is possible the question was worded badly. It is also equally possible that the rationale for a project structured to provide a racial and socioeconomic mix of pupils was either

A. Not understood, or

B. Deemed not acceptable by a high percentage of teachers in the Follow Through program.

Coupled with the comment about teachers other than Follow Through teachers not accepting Follow Through children, there may be an indication of a serious need for Follow Through program planners and managers to support, --indeed instigate Human Relations training for all school building personnel in which Follow Through classes are held.

When asked about pupil classroom interaction, all Follow Through teachers indicated that generally speaking, white and non-white pupils interacted in a positive way. The following comments are indicative of the expressions of the teachers.

> "If adults had no more trouble than children we'd have fewer racial problems", and "The children seem unaware of color and there are at least three close friendships between white and non-white students", and "It depends on the personality of the individual child. Some children are well liked, others are not. The color is not the determining factor".

Follow Through Teacher Reaction to Assistance Given by Program Assistant

As part of the Tucson Early Education Model, the Follow Through project employed three program assistants whose primary responsibility was to serve as an educational change agent through helping teachers develop skills and attitudes considered essential by Model promoters. Program assistants worked with teachers and teacher aides in the ongoing classroom setting, demonstrating desired teacher behavior by modeling with small groups of children, critiquing their own performances, helping with planning and evaluation activities.

The majority of teachers remarks about program assistants tended to be positive and in the main program assistants were perceived as being helpful and knowledgeable,

> "_____ is excellent in helping us understand the TEEM model and in giving us positive reinforcement. She has always been there when we needed (her) and is an excellent resource. ....She is a very strong and very thorough assistant."

One teacher responded somewhat negatively:

> "I don't really think I felt at ease in requesting any help. But she did volunteer specific types of services, e.g., attending a center, buying groceries, suggesting activities, _____ a constant critic."

Follow Through teachers indicated that Program Assistants could be more help to them by:

1. Providing materials for classroom activities, such as intellectual kits, games using math, phonetics, letters.

2. Spending more time in the classroom working with teachers.
3. Assuming a more professional approach

".....she was a very good teacher, but I felt she could be more effective if she would deal with teachers as professionals, and not children.

Follow Through Response to Job Training

Follow Through teachers were provided during the 1969-70 school year:

1. 30 hours of pre-service training, August 1969
2. 13 one-half day inservice sessions
3. Two training sessions at the Wichita Follow Through Conference, Spring, 1970

Follow Through teachers reported

1. All teachers who were employed before September 1969 attended the full 30 hours of pre-service training.
2. All teachers who were employed before September 1969 attended at least 13 inservice training sessions (included two sessions of Follow Through Conference.)

In the view of some Follow Through teachers, inservice training could be improved by providing

(Opportunities for)"more exchanging of ideas and presentation of teachers' ideas to groups".

"Less philosophy and more down to earth reality stuff, like what to put in centers....."

(Opportunities to) "deal with actual situations more, using small

group discussions; more critical discussions about ourselves".

Follow Through Teacher Comments about their Effectiveness with the TEEM Model; Teacher Aides

Most teachers perceived that pupil individualization was the area of greatest weakness in terms of implementing TEEM teaching techniques. No Follow Through teacher felt she had been unsuccessful in implementing the Model. In discussing teacher aide effectiveness, Follow Through teachers rated their teacher aides medium to high in quality of performance, though the majority of teachers perceived teacher aide training to be inadequate. In their views, teacher aides need help in developing their own language, writing and math skills as well as knowledge of how the program functions.

Follow Through Teacher Responses to Parent Participation in the Follow Through Project

Regarding the Parent Participation component of the Follow Through project, National Follow Through Guidelines are explicit in indicating that the school and home must each buttress the efforts of the other through two-way communication about the nature of the education process.

> "Interaction between parents and Follow Through staff...in homes, classrooms, and elsewhere in the community.....can
>
> 1. Help parents learn how they can best support and influence the program and, on their own, contribute more fully to their child's total development and
> 2. Help staff become more responsive to the needs and goals of the parents and

community and translate such goals into meaningful project activities."

Home visits were made by Follow Through teachers; the average number per year to low-income bused children's homes ranged from two to four; the average numbers of visits to neighborhood children's homes ranged from one to four.

In discussing the major benefits of making home visits, explaining the program, getting to know one another (parents and teachers), gaining insight in knowing how to deal with the child and to report on the progress of the child were mentioned most frequently by Follow Through teachers. Few teachers expressed the importance of two way communication with parents. If local program planners view the concept of dialogue and mutual contribution as significant in the development of the Parent Participation Component, Follow Through teachers and perhaps other staff members may need further assistance in the understanding of and implementing the rationale for parent participation in the Follow Through project.

Follow Through teachers, (12 out of 13) indicated that the amount of volunteer help from parents of bused pupils was inadequate. Teachers were split 6-7 as to whether volunteer help from school neighborhood residents was adequate. Major obstacles noted by Follow Through teachers in obtaining greater parent participation in the school setting were:

1. Transportation
2. Too many children in other schools
3. Small children at home
4. Lack of interest

5. Lack of confidence in ability
6. Feelings of inferiority

Program planners may want to consider:

1. Additional ways of interpreting to Follow Through staff and parents the importance of obtaining volunteer classroom assistance.
2. Ways of alleviating the obstacles to greater parent participation.

Background Information on Responses from Teacher Aides

Each Follow Through teacher was assigned a paraprofessional, teacher aide, to assist her in carrying out the classroom responsibilities. Teacher aides were asked a series of questions regarding their opinions about the Follow Through project; in addition they provided research staff with information about their education and employment backgrounds. Response from fourteen teacher aides was utilized in this reporting.

Almost one third of the teacher aides had obtained some college hours. Over 71% had graduated from high school and/or obtained some college hours.

Twelve (86%) of fourteen teacher aides were non-white; two were white.

Fifty percent of the Follow Through teacher aides completed their first year of employment in compensatory education programs in the Follow Through project. Seventy percent of the teacher aides participated in the full 30 hours of pre-service training.

In responding to a series of questions structured to elicit response indicating the level of job satisfaction, seventy percent in nearly all cases believed that the activities they did often were useful. This fact would seem to indicate high job satisfaction. Thirty-six percent of Follow

Through teacher aides reported they felt they could attend to more duties than they are presently assigned.

Most teacher aides indicated they believed the Follow Through program was very helpful to children and that in the main Follow Through pupils demonstrated considerable/great improvement in specific skill areas. Teacher aides suggested:

1. Using more men teacher aides.
2. Taking walks in the neighborhoods of bused children.
3. Obtaining, as needed, substitute teachers that know how to teach in Follow Through classrooms or pay a double salary to the aide on days when substitute teachers are needed.

PARENT PARTICIPATION

A basic tenet of Follow Through is that it is the right and responsibility of Follow Through parents to become deeply involved in the decision making processes that effect the nature of their children's education. "Accordingly, parents must be given opportunities to take an active role in all aspects of Follow Through. Interaction between parents and Follow Through staff--in homes, classrooms, and elsewhere in the community--can (1) help parents learn how they can best support and influence the program and, on their own, contribute more fully to their child's total development and (2) help staff become more responsive to the needs and goals of the parents and community and translate such goals into meaningful project activities." *

Accordingly, Follow Through program planners and managers provided

*See Follow Through Program Guidelines, February 24, 1969

opportunity for interaction between parents and Follow Through staff.

The five distinct areas of parent participation considered in this 1969-70 evaluation of Follow Through were:

1. Home visits by teachers.
2. School conferences with teachers.
3. Parent participation in the classroom as observers or volunteers.
4. Parent participation in social and/or educational meetings.
5. Parent participation in the process of making decisions about the nature and operation of Follow Through, through meetings of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC)

Information regarding parent participation was gathered from Follow Through staff reports and the data in the main lended themselves to a quantitative analysis of a rather surface or cursory nature.

The findings clearly demonstrated that a great amount of contact occurred between Follow Through staff and parents of Follow Through pupils. Follow Through teachers reported they had visited all the homes of both low-income bused pupils and neighborhood pupils at least once during the school year. From the same records it was evident that overall, Follow Through teachers fell short of achieving the goal of at least four visits during the school year to homes of bused pupils. The average number of visits reported for kindergarten was 2.7; for first grade it was 3.2.

The most commonly identified items discussed during home visits as reported by Follow Through teachers, concerned the child's progress at school, health, cleanliness, clothing, complaints of pupils and parents, and parent participation in school activities.

Parents of Follow Through pupils visited school for the purpose of conferencing with the teachers. Teachers reported that less than one third of the parents of bused kindergarten pupils visited school for this purpose during the school year; less than one fifth of the parents of bused first grade pupils attended at least one conference at school. On the other hand, less than two thirds of the parents of neighborhood pupils, both kindergarten and first grade, attended school for the purpose of conferencing with the teacher.

Parents gave many hours of their time in helping with or observing in Follow Through classrooms. Teachers reported 186 parents and friends of Follow Through pupils gave over 1,437 hours of volunteer service in Follow Through classrooms. In addition, parents of 26 Follow Through pupils accompanied classes on field trips.

Meetings for the purpose of providing information, discussing matters of mutual concern, providing certain kinds of training or simply providing a social opportunity for parents to get to know one another were held for parents of Follow Through pupils.

Thirty-seven such meetings were planned and implemented by parents and Follow Through staff. From information made available by Follow Through staff, about one-half of both low-income and neighborhood parents participated in at least one of these meetings.

The Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) which was comprised of twenty-three parents of low-income Follow Through pupils along with representatives from the Community Action Program and other agencies, met eleven times during the school year. The average number of low-income parents attending PAC

meetings was eleven; the average number of staff attending was five. Based on information made available from staff records, twenty-eight low-income Follow Through parents attended at least one PAC meeting. The average number of meetings attended by parents was three.

Discussions were held and decisions about Follow Through were made on a broad range of topics including:

1. Organization and structure of PAC
2. Appointment of committeess and representatives
3. Finance
4. Policy regarding Follow Through
5. PAC business
6. Follow Through Activities
7. Follow Through and related programs
8. Communications with related organizations.

Conclusion

Unquestionably, Follow Through schools and homes have been drawn more closely together through the efforts of Follow Through staff. Even though the reporting of Follow Through teachers indicates the goal of four home visits per low-income, Follow Through pupil, during the school year was not reached, the fact is important that even two visits a year provided opportunity to open the school and home to each other for the benefit of the child, the home and the school. Because reports by teachers of items discussed during home visits seemed highly teacher-centered and unilateral in approach, it may be that more help is needed

by teachers in focusing on broader goals in their visits; namely, to include the concept of dialogue, to become listeners, and therefore, more sensitive to the needs and desires of their pupils' parents for those whose interests they have in common, viz., children.

National Follow Through guidelines continue to place an emphasis on parent participation in Follow Through projects. More accurate and efficient means of obtaining information about these activities should be devised. In addition, some means must be found to obtain a more qualitative measure of the parent participation component.

If indeed, as National Guidelines state,

> "The Follow Through Program is committed to efforts that assist in opening up the school and the community to each other for the benefit of the child, the home and the school",

qualitative examination of changes in adult attitude and skills should be discernible if the goal is met.

COGNITIVE ABILITIES TEST

Introduction

Some education researchers, notably Arthur R. Jensen of the University of California, suggest that because of differences of about 15 points in the I. Q. scores of Negroes and Whites, there are genetic differences between the two races in learning patterns, the differences working against Negroes and disadvantaged generally when it comes to abstract reasoning or cognitive development. However, most present day educators and social scientists reject the proposition that innate ability is related to race or social class of individual children. Rather, the ability of groups of children to score high on intelligence tests is a reflection of the experiences and opportunities to which they have been exposed. This is to say, the development of cognitive skills is directly related to the quality of environmental encounters to which an individual has been subjected. Conversely, cultural deprivation can be seen as a failure to provide experiences for children that are stimulating so that brain processes can develop which can be translated into the development of cognitive ability. Presumably, the longer a child has experienced deprivation, the more pronounced are the effects on the development of these abilities. Further, studies by Benjamin Bloom, J. McVicker Hunt, and others dispel the old concept of "fixed intelligence" with their findings that intelligence is a developing function and that the effects of extreme environments on intelligence are about 20 I. Q. points. Data from the Bloom study suggest in terms of intelligence measured at age 17, about 50 percent of the development

occurs before age four, about 30 percent more before age eight, and about 20 percent more before age 17.*

A central thesis of Bloom's work is that a characteristic such as general intelligence becomes stabilized and change in this characteristic becomes more and more difficult as it is fully developed. To produce a given amount of change requires more and more powerful environments and increased amounts of effort. This is to say, it is easier to bring about a particular type of development in a preschool or primary child than at a later point.

In relation, therefore, to cognitive development, though there is a limited amount of data available at this time from studies of various programs of compensatory education, success in developing language and number skills, as well as increasing measurable intelligence and thinking abilities, depends in large part on how much effort has been made to teach these skills, to interest children in scholastic matters, and to inculcate in pupils a concern for achievement. Compensatory programs differ radically in their approaches, ranging for example, from highly structured teacher-centered programs such as Bereiter and Englemann to the spontaneous pupil interests and materials centered programs of the Montessori school. However, most evidence available at the present time tends to show that though compensatory programs do vary radically in their philosophical and program approach, children from poor families show greater gains in achievement and measurable intelligence when group activities contain heavy inputs of conceptual material in regard to language, numbers and abstractions.

* Benjamin S. Bloom, Stability and Changes in Human Characteristics New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964

In order to obtain a measure of intellectual development the Cognitive Abilities Test (CAT) was administered by classroom teachers to two groups of 1969 full year Head Start graduates, in the fall, 1969 and again in the spring, 1970. The groups to whom the test was administered were:

1. Low-income kindergarten Follow Through pupils (HSFT)
2. Low-income Head Start graduates not selected for Follow Through attending kindergarten in their neighborhood schools (HSNFT)

Instrumentation

Cognitive skill development is important in kindergarten-age children because these skills are necessary in learning to read and in learning the basic ideas of mathematics and science. The Cognitive Abilities Test purports to provide a measure of generalized thinking skills that a child needs if he is to be successful in school work. The specific areas of cognitive skills measured by the test are:

1. The ability to label or name objects or actions or to identify objects when given their use
2. The ability to identify size, position and quantity
3. The ability to see relationships and to categorize or classify objects
4. The ability to deal with quantitative relationships and concepts

The CAT was administered orally to small groups of eight or less kindergarten pupils at a time by the classroom teacher; tests were scored and the results recorded by a local school administrator who also made use of the data in a research project for a doctoral dissertation. An analysis

of CAT pretest and posttest scores is presented in the next section.

Findings

Information yielded by the Cognitive Abilities Test indicate though HSFT as a group scored higher at pretest, by posttest there were no significant differences between the scores of HSFT and HSNFT. Both groups made significant gains during the seven month testing interval; however, at both pretest and posttest both groups scored below the average DIQ of 100. This is to say, though significant gains were made by both groups of Head Start graduates the difference at posttest between the two groups in the achievement of generalized thinking skills was not significant; both groups of 1969 Head Start graduates, after one year of public school education, one group enrolled in Follow Through, one group attending neighborhood schools, continued to score below the average of their peers.

A number of important questions are generated from this finding, vis.,

1. In Wichita how do other groups of kindergarten pupils, both low-income and non-low-income compare on an intelligence test measure?
2. Can the effects of deprivation and poverty in terms of the development of actualized mental capacity (mental age) be ameliorated by additional doses of the compensatory education, Follow Through during the following school year?

Because there may be certain limitations to group administered tests, data from individually administered intelligence tests given by trained psychometrists will be utilized in next year's evaluation of the Follow Through project. The importance of obtaining comparative information on groups of pupils on the development of measurable intelligence in order to

secure baseline data from which generalizations to other test measures can be made is highly critical to the evaluation of compensatory education efforts.

THE CALIFORNIA TEST OF PERSONALITY

Introduction

The California Test of Personality was designed to identify certain intangible factors relating to personality and social adjustment. Though measurement of capacity, skill, and achievement are important in examining a child's progress in school, significant aspects, such as how a child feels about himself and about his relationships with his peers and others, can often provide clues to his personal and social adjustment. Most behavioral scientists believe adjustment to life is based on feelings of personal and social security.

The subtest, Sense of Personal Worth, is purported by the test developers to provide a measure of an individual's feelings about how he is regarded by others and about his own evaluation of his chances for future success. The Sense of Personal Worth subtest was administered by classroom teachers to small groups of kindergarten pupils in the fall, 1969, and again in the spring, 1970. The tests were collected, scored, and the results recorded by a school administrator who was also using these data as a part of a research project for a doctoral dissertation.

In order to assess the impact of the Follow Through project on kindergarten pupils in terms of their personal adjustment, the Sense of Personal Worth subtest of the California Test of Personality was administered to two groups of kindergarten pupils. They were:

1. low-income kindergarten Follow Through pupils (HSFT)
2. low-income Head Start graduates not selected for Follow Through

attending kindergarten in the neighborhood schools (HSNFT)

Findings

After examining the pre and posttest scores it was found that the correlation between pre and posttest scores for both groups was not as strong as might have been anticipated. Which is to say, apparently those who scored highest on the pretest did not necessarily score highest at posttest. Neither group made significant gains during the testing interval of seven months and there was no difference in the amount of gain made when comparing the two groups.

The average score of HSNFT was slightly higher, though not significantly so at pretest and posttest.

In conclusion, the following questions have been raised in regard to the findings on the Sense of Personal Worth subtest.

1. Why did not the pretest and posttest scores correlate more strongly?
2. What is the norm for this subtest? This is to say, how do other pupils (low-income and non-low-income) score on this subtest? (Norms are available for several subtests as well as for the entire California Test of Personality, but norms are not available for just one subtest)
3. Is it reasonable to anticipate that the effects of deprivation and poverty, which often produce lessened feelings of self-worth, can be remediated significantly during a seven-month testing interval? That is, if the environment in which a child has lived for five years is attributable to lessened feelings of self-worth, no matter

how strong the program input, could we logically expect that the effects of said program would be measurable on a short-term basis?

4. What are the limitations of a group administered test of this type for this age child, especially for those kindergarten children who come to school with severe educational deficiencies?

Further investigation is needed in order to answer these questions.

LEE CLARK READING READINESS TEST

Introduction

The Lee-Clark Reading Readiness Test is a part of the basic testing program of the Wichita Public School System; that is to say, the test is administered and scored by the classroom teacher and is given to all first grade pupils in the school system in the fall of every year. The test purports to predict a child's ability to learn to read and consists of four subtests which include measuring the pupils ability to match similar and dissimilar letters and words, oral vocabulary and understanding of concepts as well as ability to follow directions.

The scores of five groups of first grade pupils were analyzed in order to obtain information about the comparative reading readiness of children participating in the Follow Through project: three groups were comprised of children from low-income families, and two groups from non-low-income families. Specifically the groups designated were:

Low-Income Groups

1. Low-income first grade Follow Through pupils (1968 full year Head Start graduates) (HSFT)
2. Low-income full year 1968 Head Start graduates not selected for Follow Through attending neighborhood schools (HSNFT)
3. First grade low-income pupils who participated in neither Head Start or Follow Through (NHSNFT-LI)

Non-Low-Income Groups

4. First grade classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL)
5. First grade non-low-income pupils not participating in the Follow

Through project.

Findings

At the beginning of first grade, 1968 Head Start graduates who participated in Follow Through for one year, viz., kindergarten did not evidence significantly greater readiness for reading as measured by the Lee Clark Reading Readiness Test than did 1968 Head Start graduates who were not in Follow Through and attended the neighborhood schools. However, both groups of Head Start graduates demonstrated significantly greater reading readiness than did low-income pupils who participated in neither Head Start or Follow Through.

The classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils evidenced comparable reading readiness to the group of non-low-income first grade pupils not participating in Follow Through. There were, however, significant differences between the scores of low-income and non-low-income Follow Through pupils. This finding was anticipated for it is a well documented fact that home background and the broader frame of reference of pupils from non-low-income families would, generally speaking be reflected in higher achievement and readiness scores. These differences remain even after exposure to one full year of Follow Through. The final two years of the Follow Through project in which there is an emphasis placed on developing reading skills will provide the opportunity to determine if these differences can be obliterated.

ILLINOIS TEST OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC ABILITIES

Introduction

Most educators believe language is the key to learning. A high percentage of children, disadvantaged by virtue of culturally and socially impoverished home environments, enter school with such serious language deficiencies that they are unable to make use of regular public school programs in a way that middle class children historically have done.

Behavioral scientists and educators have long recognized that there is a close relationship between the ability to communicate and the ability to develop cognitive skills. That is to say, if a child is deficient in language skill he will have difficulty organizing his perceptual skills for, if words cannot be understood there will be great difficulty in carrying out described activity. It is for this reason Follow Through program planners and evaluators are concerned with the language development skills of pupils participating in the Follow Through project.

The Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities is a test designed to detect specific abilities or disabilities in language development; it is useful as a diagnostic tool and also as an aid in designing remedial programs. Two subtests, Auditory Association and Verbal Expression, were administered by trained psychometrists to individual kindergarten pupils in the fall, 1969 and spring, 1970; the auditory-vocal association and vocal encoding subtests which are comparable subtests to those given to kindergarten pupils were administered to first grade pupils, spring, 1970. Kindergarten pupils received the revised edition of the test; first grade pupils received

the same test (experimental edition) as was given one year ago.

The auditory association (auditory-vocal association) subtest taps the child's ability to relate concepts presented orally. A sentence technique is used, presenting one statement followed by an incomplete analagous statement, and allows the child to complete the second statement appropriately, i.e., "I cut with a saw; I pound with a _____". "A dog has hair; a fish has _____". The analagous statements are presented in the order of increasing difficulty. Scores on this subtest correlate highly with the Binet and WISC which provide measures of actualized mental capacity (mental age). This subtest therefore, provides a measure not only for determining the equivalence of groups before treatment, but also provides baseline data from which generalizations to other data can be made.

The verbal expression (vocal encoding) subtest assesses the ability of the child to express his own concepts vocally. The child is shown four familiar objects, one at a time (i.e., a red rubber ball) and asked, "Tell me all about this." The score is the number of discrete, relevant and approximately factual concepts expressed. The ability of a child to verbalize his thoughts provides one means of determining his ability to understand the concepts of size, shape, color, etc.

The entire ITPA was adminisited in the fall, 1968 and again in the spring, 1970, to a sample of two groups of 1968 Head Start graduates: viz., low-income kindergarten Follow Through pupils (HSFT) and those pupils who were not selected for Follow Through and attended neighborhood schools(HSNFT). A report was published on these findings.*

*See Evaluation Report, September 1968 - May, 1969 Follow Through Project, Wichita Public Schools

Two subtests of the ITPA, auditory (vocal) association and vocal encoding (verbal expression) were administered to the same sample of 1968 Head Start graduates in May, 1970, one year following the last ITPA testing at the completion of first grade. In addition, the two subtests were administered to three other groups of first grade pupils viz., low-income non-Head Start (NHSNFT-LI), to the classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and to a non-low-income comparison group not participating in Follow Through. (NHSNFT-NLI)

Further, the two subtests of the ITPA, auditory association and verbal expression were given to the five groups of kindergarten pupils in the fall, 1969 and again in the spring, 1970. (For a more complete discussion of comparison groups see pages 6 - 9 , of this report)

The raw and language age scores of the comparison groups noted above were analyzed and the report of the analysis follows.

Findings

Regarding Auditory Association, Kindergarten

In September 1969, the two kindergarten low-income comparison groups were equivalent to the experimental group on the auditory association subtest. During the seven month testing interval all three kindergarten low-income groups made significant gains; however, by spring, 1970 the experimental group scored significantly higher than Head Start graduates attending neighborhood schools or low-income kindergarten children who participated in neither Head Start or Follow Through. At posttest, seven months after pretest all three low-income groups achieved below their mean chronological age; however, greatest gains were made by the experimental

group, i.e., eleven months during the seven month testing interval. Head Start graduates attending kindergarten in neighborhood schools gained a total of ten months during the same interval; non-Head Start low-income pupils gained eight months during the seven month testing interval. Obviously, low-income kindergarten Follow Through pupils made the greatest gains of the three low-income groups in decreasing deficits in pupils ability to make use of orally presented concepts.

Considering the two non-low-income comparison groups, viz., neighborhood school classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and the non-low-income comparison group not participating in Follow Through, (NHSNFT-NLI) the groups were equivalent at pretest and at posttest seven months later continued to be equivalent; at posttest both groups achieved seven months above the group mean chronological age. From the analysis by school kindergarten auditory association scores, greatest gains occurred at School IV with net gains of 16 months for HSFT and 18 months for FTCL.

Regarding Auditory Association, First Grade

Both the experimental group HSFT, (low-income first grade Follow Through pupils) and first grade Head Start Non Follow Through pupils (HSNFT) made significant gains during the interval of May, 1969-May 1970. (Data were not available to compute gains on the non-Head Start low-income group (NHSNFT-LI). Significant differences existed between the scores of the experimental group and HSNFT in May, 1969 in favor of the former and continued to May, 1970; highly significant differences existed in May, 1970 between HSFT and NHSNFT-LI in favor of HSFT. Of the three low-income comparison groups only the experimental group achieved above the group's

chronological age, May, 1970. HSNFT demonstrated six months retardation May, 1970. At the same time NHSNFT-LI demonstrated 13 months retardation.

The two non-low-income groups, first grade classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and the non-low-income comparison group not participating in Follow Through (NHSNFT-NLI) were equivalent May, 1970 and both groups achieved above their groups mean chronological age. Further, in May, 1970 the experimental group (HSFT) achieved at a rate equal to their non-low-income classmates. Both HSFT and FTCL achieved above their groups mean chronological age, May, 1970. In other words in terms of a child's ability to make use of orally presented concepts, and in terms of scores that correlate with the Binet and WISC, measures of mental age, following three years of compensatory education viz., Head Start and two years of Follow Through, as of May, 1970, HSFT=FTCL=NHSNFT-NLI. The significance of this finding is substantial for it provides evidence that certain effects of poverty and deprivation can be ameliorated after three years of compensatory program; NHSNFT-LI, on the other hand, after two years of standard programs, demonstrated a full year's retardation in terms of ability to relate to orally presented concepts, by the end of first grade.

Regarding Verbal Expression - Kindergarten

In September 1969, the two kindergarten low-income comparison groups were equivalent to the experimental group on the verbal expression subtest. This is to say, at the beginning of the kindergarten school year the three low-income comparison groups started with (statistically) equal skill in ability to verbalize understanding of important concepts

of size, shape, color, function, etc. Statistically significant gains were made by all three groups; however, by May, 1970 (posttest) significant differences existed in the mean scores in favor of the experimental group: of the three low-income comparison groups at posttest only HSFT achieved above the mean chronological age. The net gain for HSFT on the verbal expression subtest during the seven month testing interval was 19 months. HSNFT showed a 13 month gain whereas NHSNFT-LI demonstrated a seven month gain.

In comparing the verbal expression scores of the two non-low-income groups viz., the classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and the non-low-income comparison group (NHSNFT-NLI) not participating in Follow Through at pretest, September 1969, at the beginning of the kindergarten year significant differences existed between the two groups in favor of FTCL. Further, significant gains were made only by FTCL during the school year and therefore the differences were greatly increased by posttest. In examining the language age scores it was found that FTCL gained a total of 15 months during the seven month testing interval; the non-low-income comparison group suffered a loss of two months in verbal ability during the same interval. At posttest FTCL functioned 13 months above the group's mean chronological age whereas the non-low-income comparison group functioned five months below.

At the present time the loss in verbal ability of NHSNFT-NLI pupils cannot be explained. However, the outstanding gains in verbal ability of both low and non-low-income pupils should be noted.

Regarding Verbal Expression, First Grade

Both groups of 1968 Head Start graduates viz., HSFT (low-income first grade Follow Through pupils) and HSNFT (first grade Head Start Non Follow Through pupils) made significant gains during the one year testing interval between May, 1969 and May, 1970. Data were not available to determine gains of the third low-income group (non-Head Start non-Follow Through). There were no significant differences in the verbal expression scores between HSFT and HSNFT in May, 1969 or in May, 1970; however, there were significant differences between HSFT and NHSNFT-LI in May, 1970. (May 1969 data were not available on NHSNFT-LI) In considering the three low-income groups, in May, 1970, only the experimental group, HSFT, achieved above the group's mean chronological age; HSNFT demonstrated two months retardation in May, 1970 and NHSNFT-LI demonstrated 13 months retardation.

Considering the two non-low-income comparison groups, viz., classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and the non-low-income comparison group of Non Head Start Non Follow Through pupils (NHSNFT-NLI), the groups were found to be equivalent in May, 1970. Both groups achieved above their mean chronological age in May, 1970. Further, Follow Through pupils - low-income and non-low-income were found to be statistically equivalent in May, 1970.

Conclusion

If, in fact, language is the key to learning, Follow Through program planners and managers should be heartened by the findings of the analysis of the 1969-70 ITPA scores. The data consistently show gains in favor of the low-income Follow Through pupils and increasing retardation in the low-income comparison groups. Head Start graduates showed less retardation than those low-income pupils who had not participated in either Head Start or Follow Through. Further, the fact that auditory association scores of the experimental group at the end of first grade were equivalent to scores of their non-low-income classmates, whose scores in turn were equivalent to the scores of non-low-income pupils not participating in Follow Through (i.e., HSFT=FTCL=NHSNFT-NLI) is very substantial. Data seem to indicate that in terms of language development the Follow Through project is able to ameliorate the effects of social and cultural deprivation caused by unstable home environment and poverty. And too, though program planners believe in the efficacy of providing socioeconomically and racially integrated educational opportunities, that is, programs which closely simulate the real life adult community environment, they are convinced that it is educationally unsound if one group of children viz., low-income, achieve at the expense of another group, viz., non-low-income. Therefore, to be able to say that low-income Follow Through pupils are in fact achieving at a rate comparable to their non-low-income classmates, who in turn are achieving at a rate comparable to non-low-income pupils not in Follow Through, is indeed a substantial finding.

It remains to be seen if in another year the rates of achievement in language development can be maintained for Follow Through pupils.

THE KINDERGARTEN CHECK LIST

Introduction

The Kindergarten Check List which was developed by Dr. Joseph Brewer, Director of Wichita Guidance Center, provides a measure of a teacher's perception of a kindergarten child's adjustment to school and readiness for learning. The philosophical underpinning of the Check List is that learning is facilitated by at least three interrelated elements, namely:

1. The capacity of a child to function effectively, using knowledge and reason (cognitive functioning)
2. The ability of a child to relate positively to his peers and others
3. A positive self concept

It is the attainment and intermeshing of these elements in the areas of cognitive functioning, interpersonal relationships and positive feelings of self worth which promote learning skills (i.e. reading skills)

Dr. Brewer contends that certain behavior characteristics in children, related to the elements which disencumber learning, and which portend success or lack of success in school, are easily identifiable by the kindergarten classroom teacher.

The Check List consists of twenty-two items which concern the child's ability to take care of personal needs, ability to work independently, to assume responsibility, listening habits, ability to relate positively with peers and teacher, interest in school activities, etc. Scores may range from 0 to 66: low score is an indication of good adjustment, high score, an

indication of poor adjustment. Which is to say, the lower the score the more ready for academic work is the student. The test was standardized and the items correlated with the major concern of first grade teachers, the ability of pupils to read by the end of the year. (1st grade)

Findings

The Check List was scored by classroom teachers on the five comparison groups of kindergarten pupils, i. e.,

1. Low-income kindergarten Follow Through pupils (HSFT)
2. Low-income Head Start graduates attending kindergarten in neighborhood schools (HSNFT)
3. Low-income kindergarten pupils who participated in neither Head Start or Follow Through and who attended neighborhood schools (NHSNFT-LI)
4. Non-low-income kindergarten classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils (FTCL) and
5. Non-low-income kindergarten pupils not participating in Follow Through (NHSNFT-NLI)

The scoring was done in the fall of 1969 (pretest) and in the spring of 1970 (posttest). The findings were as follows:

1. At pretest, considering all five comparison groups, only the non-low-income group not participating in Follow Through scored below the standardized norm. Which is to say, when contrasting scores of all five comparison groups with the average score made by kindergarten pupils in Wichita, only the group of non-low-income, non-Follow Through pupils demonstrated adjustment to school and

readiness for learning --- equal to or better than the average or norm. The three low-income comparison groups and Follow Through Classmates demonstrated less readiness than the norm at pretest.

2. By posttest in the spring of 1970, though all five groups evidenced gains in adjustment and readiness, again only the non-low-income Follow Through group scored equal to or better than the norm.

Greatest gains were demonstrated by Head Start graduates attending the neighborhood schools. Least gains in adjustment were made by low-income Follow Through pupils.

Further, at posttest, in the view of classroom teachers, over one-fourth of the low-income Follow Through pupils demonstrated behavior which test developers consider severe maladjustment, warranting further investigation. 18% of HSNFT were so perceived at posttest, and 21% of NHSNFT-LI. "Severe maladjustment" was also demonstrated at posttest by 12.7 percent of the classmates of low-income Follow Through pupils. Only 1.7% of the non-low-income comparison groups not participating in Follow Through were so perceived by their teachers in the spring of 1970.

Follow Through teachers identified the following items in May, 1970 as being significant in the lack of adjustment of their pupils. (Ranked from highest to lowest in percentage of teachers expressing this as a problem)

1. Is unable to get along with his peers.
2. Does not accept correction or criticism.
3. Lacks self-confidence.

4. Has a short attention span.

5. Does not assume responsibility.

These findings are curious, thought provoking and are very different from last year's findings in which Follow Through pupils made greatest gains. Unquestionabley, further research is needed in order to more fully understand the information yielded by this data. Certain questions arise immedicately, however.

1. Can support through in-service training or other means be provided teachers which will bear directly in helping them continue to cope with and ameliorate the behavior problems evidenced by their pupils?
2. Are the kindergarten Check List scores indicative of a more general dissatisfaction or malaise of Follow Through teachers in regard to the Follow Through program? If this were the case, other evidence should be considered, such as teacher turnover rates and teacher response to questionnaires.
3. Is it possible that Follow Through teachers tend to have a more rigid mind set in regard to their expectations of optimum pupil behavior?

Further research is needed to illuminate these findings.